



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,622	05/22/2006	Engbert Hermanues Pakkert	207.435	2439
7590	11/03/2009			
Abelman Frayne & Schwab 666 Third Avenue New York, NY 10017-5612				EXAMINER BAINBRIDGE, ANDREW PHILIP
ART UNIT 3754		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 11/03/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/565,622	PAKKERT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ANDREW P. BAINBRIDGE	3754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-13 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-13 and 15-22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 January 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/26/2009, 9/1/2009</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 16-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2003/0071067 (Sluijter) in view of US 4,402,429 (Vanden Driessche).**

4. Sluijter in figures 1-5 discloses a container 31 filled with carbonated beverages that is seated in a cooling chamber 32 and has an outlet line 37 that allows pressurized fluid to exit the container 31 and pass by a tap handle when the pinch valve 35 is open to dispense its contents via an outlet 36, the container is selectively pressurized from a compressor 40 via a pressure line 41 that fluidly communicates with the interior of the container 31 when the hinged lid 41, 43 is closed and locked 64 onto the top of the cooling chamber 32 and container 31, the lid 43 having a lug 44 that opens the

dispensing line 60, and the pressure line 41 is connected 42 with the interior of the container 31 to pressurize the container once the lid is closed. Sluijter does not teach the container having a reservoir filled with a pressure medium that is connected to a pressure medium feed line. Driessche in figures 1-5 teaches a replaceable CO₂ cartridge 6 that seated inside the container 2 that is tapped open 14 by a pressure regulating spring 17 that fluidly communicates with the interior of the container 2 by a pressure feed passage 8 once the hinged lid 18, 23 is closed. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Driessche to Sluijter because Driessche provides a way to make the hinged lid pressure keg stay portable rather than being stuck with a compressor to create the pressurized air.

5. **Claims 2, 5, 10-13, 15, 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sluijter in view of Driessche as applied in claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 respectively, and further in view of US 4,702,396 (Gwiazda).**

6. Sluijter in view of Driessche as applied in claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 respectively has all of the elements of claims 2, 5, 10-13, 15, 18 and 20-22 except for the pressure line being connected to an expansion chamber and a pressure regulator that serves to reduce the pressure of the fluid between the CO₂ cartridge and the carbonated beverage container. Gwiazda in figures 1-2 teaches a device 1 that has a CO₂ cartridge 3' and an expansion chamber 22, 32 that has a pressure regulator 37 that serves to lower the pressure of the fluid prior to reaching the interior of the container 8,

12. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Gwiazda to the Sluijter-Driessche combination because Gwiazda provides a reliable and well

understood way to pressure regulate the pressure reservoir prior to over-pressurizing the container's contents.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW P. BAINBRIDGE whose telephone number is (571)270-3767. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, 9:30 AM to 8:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. P. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3754